

February 27, 1976

required an upland game stamp of a dollar. We are requiring a habitat stamp in lieu of the upland game stamp of \$7.50. This money must be used for the acquisition, leasing, taking of easements for the enhancement, management and development of wildlife habitat. There are also, in the bill, increases in the various hunting licenses. Now I could go down and list all of these increases but they are printed out in the bill. I will mention two or three of the most common hunting fees and fishing fees. The resident hunting license is being increased from \$4.50 to \$6.50. The resident fishing license from \$4.00 to \$7.50. The nonresident hunting license from \$25 to \$30 and the nonresident fishing license from \$15 to \$20. All nonresidents would be required to purchase the habitat stamp which would be worth \$7.50. The bill would create approximately 2.7 million dollars in revenue. This 2.7 million dollars within the scope of the bill is designed for acquisition, leasing and taking of easements. A portion of this money, approximately 40%, is allocated to enter local cooperation with the Natural Resource Districts. Many of the twenty-four Natural Resource Districts throughout the state have some type of wildlife program. This could range from fencing to seeding, which would have conservation benefits in addition to wildlife benefits, and these funds would be matched in cooperation with the Natural Resource District which would conceivably stretch these funds out to approximately four million dollars being allocated to the enhancement of habitat. All acquisition, leasing and taking of easements must be done on an arms length basis, willing seller, willing buyer. There is absolutely no power of condemnation. There is no provision of eminent domain within this bill. The Game Commission today does not have eminent domain or power of condemnation. One of the major objections to LB488 on this floor several weeks ago was taking marginal lands off the tax rolls. This bill requires the Game Commission to continue payments to that subdivision of any land that they may acquire in lieu of taxes. Therefore, we should have no opposition from those people who see taking marginal lands off the tax rolls as a shift to productive lands. There is no provision or desire in this bill and a matter of economics to take productive land out of production. That absolutely cannot be. It is just economically infeasible...unfeasible when we look at the price of land today. Frankly, the idea is not mine. The idea came out of a habitat conference attended by various farm groups, sportsmen groups, ecologists, Game and Parks Commission and members of this Legislature. This was held in February of last year, barely a year ago. That conference was the father of this idea. With the shocking demise and decrease of habitat, I only wish that this was the solution. This is not the solution. Last year, we lost...or since 1973, we have lost over three hundred thousand acres of prime habitat due primarily to the loss of set aside acre programs. Now it doesn't take too much of a mathematician to figure that this is